

REMARKS

Claim 9 has been cancelled without prejudice and new Claim 10 has been added in place thereof. Claim 10 is considered to more clearly define the invention with the embodiment of the invention as described on page 22, line 33-page 4, line 7 and FIGS. 3 and 4 of the drawing.

Claims 4-8 have been amended so that they are now dependent upon newly added Claim 10 rather than on cancelled Claim 9.

The rejection of Claims 4-8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C.102(b) as anticipated by Scholer as evidenced by Ralston is considered to lack merit.

Scholer is not considered to teach or even suggest, the combination of an ion exchange cartridge and a device for regenerating the cartridge as defined by even Claim 10, the most generic claim, or even any combination of an ion exchange cartridge and a device for regenerating the cartridge.

Unlike the combination defined by Claim 10, the liquid treating unit of Scholer does not comprise an ion exchange cartridge particularly one having an inlet and an outlet but instead comprises loose particles of ion exchange material 17 provided in a tank 16.

Additionally, unlike the combination defined by Claim 10, the element of the liquid treating unit of Scholer holding the ion exchange material, tank 16, does not have an inlet directly

connected to the outlet of the reservoir of regenerant material, pipe 46 of container 22, to the inlet, pipe 47, of tank 16. Instead pipe 46 of container 22 is indirectly connected to pipe 47 of tank 16 through valve components comprised in sections 32 and 33.

Ralston is not considered to provide evidence that the device of Scholer is inherently capable of being used with an ion exchange cartridge as the Examiner contends. Clearly, the water treatment apparatus of Ralston, which may be considered to contain an ion exchange cartridge, cartridge 17, in a tank, but comprises no device for regenerating the cartridge, cannot be considered to provide any suggestion of employing an ion exchange cartridge in the ion exchange regenerating device comprising liquid treating device of Scholer.

The rejection of Claims 4-8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Scholer in view of Ralston is considered to lack merit.

This combination of references is not considered to teach, or even suggest, the combination of an ion exchange cartridge and a device for regenerating the cartridge as defined by even Claim 10, the most generic claim.

Scholer is not considered to teach, or even suggest, the combination of an ion exchange cartridge and a device for regenerating the cartridge defined by Claim 10 for reasons given supra.

Ralston is not considered to fill the above-noted gaps in the teaching of Scholer Ralston which discloses only a water treatment apparatus comprising an ion exchange cartridge, but no device for regenerating the cartridge, clearly would not provide any suggestion to a person of ordinary skill in the art that would lead such a person to fill in the gaps in the teaching of Scholer so as to arrive at the combination defined by Claim 10.

An early allowance of the claims and case is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By Norman N. Spain
Norman N. Spain, Reg. 17,846
Attorney
(914) 333-9653

OFFICE

FAX RECEIVED

AUG 22 2003

TC 1700